



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/666,402

09/17/2003

Xin Xue

SONY-26500

9325

28960 7590 04/14/2010  
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP  
162 N WOLFE ROAD  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2194

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/14/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/666,402	<b>Applicant(s)</b> XUE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> VAN H. NGUYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2194	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-20,23-34,37-51,54-66 and 69-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-20, 23-34, 37-51, 54-66, and 69-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/15/2010</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 01/15/2010, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Hyung S. Sough/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2194

Claims 1, 4-20, 23-34, 37-51, 54-66, and 69-85 are pending in the application.

### Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed 02/15/2010, has been received, entered into the record, and considered. A copy of PTO 1449 form is attached.

### Claim Objections

3. Claim 46 is objected to because of the following informalities: "*The method of claim 47*" should read "*The method of claim 34*". Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-20, 23-34, 37-51, 54-66, and 69-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kloba** (US 6,341,316 B1) in view of **Kiiskinen et al.** (US 20030217181 A1).

**As to claim 1**, Kloba teaches a network of devices to filter synchronized data, the network of devices comprising:

a content server to store content [col. 8 lines 15 – 28; col. 12 lines 35 – 45];  
a first network device [col. 8 lines 15 – 28; col. 12 lines 35 – 45]; and  
a middleware filter coupled to the first network device and to the content server such that during a data synchronization, content is received by the middleware filter from the content server according to the data synchronization and the middleware filter is programmed to selectively filter the content resulting in filtered content and send only the filtered content to the first network device [col. 5 lines 41 – 52; col. 14 lines 29 – 53; col. 20 lines 15 – 34].

However, Kloba does not explicitly teach the following additional limitations:

But Kiiskinen discloses the middleware filter selectively filters in response meta data within the content, wherein the meta data comprises a data type of the content [see paragraphs [0034], [0039], and [0057]].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kloba with Kiiskinen because it would have facilitated synchronizing data stores on different devices, including telecommunications and computing devices.

**As to claim 4**, Kloba teaches the middleware filter reads the metadata of the content received from the content server and sends the content to the first network device if the data type of the read metadata matches an authorized data type associated with the first network device [Table 3; col. 6 lines 1 – 38; col. 15 lines 15 – 34].

**As to claim 5**, Kloba teaches the middleware filter stores the authorized data type of the first network device [col. 4 line 66 – col. 5 line 6; col. 8 lines 31 – 37].

**As to claim 6**, Kloba teaches the metadata includes an authorized network device type [Table 3; col. 5 line 64 – col. 6 line 38].

**As to claim 7**, Kloba teaches the middleware filter reads the metadata of the content received from the content server and sends the content to the first network device if the authorized network device type of the read metadata matches a network device type associated with the first network device [Table 3; col. 5 line 64 – col. 6 line 38].

**As to claim 8**, Kloba teaches the middleware filter stores the network device type of the first network device [col. 4 line 66 – col. 5 line 6; col. 8 lines 31 – 37].

**As to claim 9**, Kloba teaches the metadata is added to the content by the content server [Fig. 1; col. 28 lines 20 – 22].

**As to claim 10**, Kloba teaches the metadata includes data synchronization information corresponding to the data synchronization [col. 22 lines 12 – 37].

**As to claim 11**, Kloba teaches a display coupled to the middleware filter to display the data synchronization information [col. 8 lines 55 – 60; col. 12 lines 59 – 60].

**As to claim 12**, Kloba teaches the data synchronization is a one-way data synchronization [col. 14 lines 46 – 53].

**As to claim 13**, Kloba teaches the data synchronization is a bi-directional data synchronization [col. 5 lines 35 – 40].

**As to claim 14**, Kloba teaches the middleware filter is within a second network device and the second network device comprises a personal computer [col. 8 lines 15 – 28].

**As to claim 15**, Kloba teaches the first network device comprises a PDA [col. 10 lines 32 – 42].

**As to claim 16**, Kloba teaches the content server comprises a web server [col. 4 lines 54 – 58; col. 27 lines 12 – 24].

**As to claim 17**, Kloba teaches the middleware filter is within a second network device and the second network device comprises a server [col. 5 lines 41 – 67; col. 6 lines 25 – 38; col. 14 lines 29 – 53].

**As to claim 18**, Kloba teaches a second network device coupled in between the content server and the first network device, wherein the second network device includes the middleware filter [col. 5 lines 41 – 52; col. 7 line 66 – col. 8 line 7].

**As to claim 19**, Kloba at least implies the content server can include the middleware filter because Figure 36 shows the clients connected to the server without showing an external content provider. Furthermore, Kloba teaches the providers can include a server that provides content and is similar to the server 104 shown in Figure 1 [col. 12 lines 35 – 44]. Therefore, it is at least implied that the server in Figure 36 can also provide the content, making it obvious to have the content server include the middleware filter.

**As to claim 20**, see the rejections of claims 1, 14, 15 and 18.

**As to claims 23 – 33**, see the rejections of claims 4 – 13 and 16.

**As to claim 34**, see the rejections of claims 1 and 18.

**As to claims 37 – 50**, see the rejections of claims 4 – 17.

**As to claim 51**, see the rejection of claim 1. Also, see Kloba column 5 lines 41 – 67 and column 20 lines 15 – 18.

**As to claims 54 – 65**, see the rejections of claims 4 – 13, 15 and 16.

**As to claims 66 , 69– 78, 80 and 81**, see the rejections of claims 1, 4 – 13, 15 and 16.

**As to claim 79**, see the rejections of claims 14 and 18.

**As to claim 82**, see the rejections of claims 17 and 18.

**As to claims 83 – 85**, see the rejection of claim 1.

### **Response to Arguments**

5. Applicant's arguments filed 01/15/2010 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Conclusion**

6. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention. Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

### **Contact Information**

7. Any inquiry or a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM- 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, HYUNG S. SOUGH can be reached at (571) 272-6799.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VAN H NGUYEN/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194